

REMARKS

Claims 7 and 11-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 7 is amended to even more clearly distinguish from the cited references and claims 11-19 are amended for clarity. Support for the amendment of claim 7 can be found in Applicants' specification, for example, at page 6, line 18 through page 7, line 1. Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of claims 16, 18 and 19. No new matter is added by the amendments.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Rachuba during the telephone interview held May 19 are appreciated. During the interview, it was agreed that the above amendments overcome the rejections.

Claims 7 and 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takahashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,938,510) in view of Hutchison (U.S. Patent No. 5,954,569). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Takahashi, when modified in view of Hutchison, fails to disclose or render obvious the combination of features recited in independent claim 7. In particular, Takahashi in view of Hutchison fails to disclose or render obvious " b) a turret for holding multiple polishing bodies during polishing operations; c) a turret driver for rotating the turret between polishing operations to interchange between polishing bodies being positioned opposite the object to be polished" and "wherein the driver is a single driver including means for selectively coupling to each of the multiple polishing bodies when the turret positions each of the multiple polishing bodies opposite the object to be polished" as recited in independent claim 7. Thus, claim 7 is patentable. Accordingly, claims 11-15 also are patentable by their dependence on claim 7 for at least the reasons explained above regarding claim 7. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takahashi in view of Hutchison in further view of Senga (U.S. Patent No. 6,520,895). Senga fails to overcome the

deficiencies of Takahashi and Hutchison explained above regarding claim 7. Thus, claim 17 is patentable by its dependence on claim 7 for at least the reasons explained above regarding claim 7. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Robert G. Bachner
Registration No. 60,122

JAO:RGB/emd

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: June 4, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--